Isaiah's Parable of the Vineyard

By PAUL HAUPT
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

ISAIAH'S PARABLE OF THE VINEYARD.

BY PAUL HAUPT,
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Cheyne says in his notes on Is. **5**, in *The Polychrome Bible*, that 'the Parable of the Vineyard takes the form of a song. The prophet assumes the character of a popular singer. If he accompanied his song with music, he must have changed his note at v. 3, and what an effect must have been produced when in the middle of a sentence (v. 6) he suddenly passed out of the lyric into the grave prophetic rhythm, and became no longer a singer but an orator.' These remarks are evidently based on Duhm's commentary.* Duhm's analysis of the poem has been adopted also by Marti.† Duhm thinks that there is a different rhythm from וְעָלָה שָׁמִיר וָשָׁיִת on; but this clause is a gloss, and the following lines exhibit the same rhythm as the preceding stanzas. In his *Introduction*‡ Cheyne says that vv. 1–7 are in two distinct rhythms or meters; the division is at v. 6ᶜ, when Isaiah, in the midst of his threatening prophecy respecting the vineyard, suddenly exchanges the light, dancing, popular rhythm for a heavy prophetic parallelism.

Ewald‖ arranged only the first two verses in lines, evidently thinking that the rhythm in the following verses was different.

---

* First edition, Göttingen, 1892; second edition, 1902.

† *Das Buch Jesaia* (Freiburg i. B. 1900), p. 55.

‡ *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (London, 1895), p. 23.

‖ *Jesaia²* (Göttingen, 1867), p. 306.

In Hitzig's translation of the poetical books of the Old Testament, on the other hand, the whole poem is printed in lines.* In Kautzsch's *Textbibel* (1899) the second half of v. 5 and vv. 6. 7 are printed in lines, but not the preceding verses. Cersoy,† on the other hand, thinks that the first two verses were borrowed by Isaiah from a popular song, but that the following verses are not metrical. If we look at Sievers'‡ arrangement of the poem we can easily see how a commentator may arrive at the conclusion that vv. 3–7 are not metrical; for there is apparently no regularity whatsoever. But if the song is freed from superfluous scribal expansions the meter is the same from the first verse to the last.

There is no change of rhythm in the poem. This parable consists of four‖ stanzas; each stanza is composed of four משלים§ with two beats in each hemistich. Each of the first three stanzas comprises two Masoretic verses, while the last stanza is represented by v. 7. The text of the first three stanzas is on the whole correct but considerably expanded; in the last stanza, on the other hand, we find an omission and a corruption. The scribal expansions are all such as we frequently meet with in other texts of the Old Testament.

I would arrange the Hebrew text as follows: **

---

* *Die poetischen Bücher des AT* (Leipzig, 1854); so, too, in Hendewerk's *Jesaja*, part 1 (Königsberg, 1838), p. 129, and in Umbreit's commentary (Hamburg, 1846).

† *L'apologue de la Vigne au chapitre Vᵉ d'Isaïe* in the *Revue Biblique* (Jan. 1899), pp. 3–12 (cited in Marti's commentary, p. 55). *Cf.* ZA **9**, 361.

‡ *Metrische Studien* (Leipzig, 1901), p. 434.

‖ Ernst Meier in his commentary (Pforzheim, 1850) divided the poem into two stanzas: vv. 1–4 and 5–7.

§ See my paper on The Poetic Form of the First Psalm in HEBRAICA, **19**, 137, n. 15. The four double-hemistichs of each stanza may be grouped in two couplets.

** The arrangement of Hebrew poetic texts in double-hemistichs, in two columns, which I introduced in part **15** (Proverbs) and **4** (Numbers, cc. **21. 23. 24**) of *The Polychrome Bible*, is found in certain Hebrew MSS, *e. g.*, in the Sephardic MS, British Museum, Oriental 2201. In this beautiful quarto MS, which is one of the oldest dated copies of the entire Hebrew Bible, having been written at Toledo in 1246 A. D., the three poetical books, Psalms, Proverbs, and Job, are written in double-hemistichs, in two columns. A collotyped facsimile reproduction of folio 283ᵃ (containing Ps. **106**, 23ᵇ–**107**, 32) of this MS is given on plate ix of the Series of XV Facsimiles of MSS of the Hebrew Bible published by James Hyatt (London, 1897). Ginsburg says in his description of this plate, 'The three poetical books are arranged in prescribed lines,' whatever that may mean; see also Ginsburg's *Introduction to the Masoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (London, 1897), p. 675; *cf.* also *ibid.*, pp. 517. 729. Ginsburg's remarks are unfortunately not sufficiently clear (*cf. op. cit.*, pp. 591. 598. 606. 667). *Cf.* also the Cod. Or. Gaster. 151 described in PSBA **22**, 234.

שירת הכרם לישעיהו

I   1   אשירה־נא לידידי   שירת־ᵃ כרמו
כרם ᵇ לידידי   בקרן בן־שׁמן׃

2   ויעזקהו ויסקלהו   ויטעהו שׂרק
ויבן מגדל ᵍ   וגם־יקב חצב־בו ᵈ׃

II   3   יושׁב ירושׁלם   ואישׁ יהודה
שׁפטו־נא ביני   ובין כרמי׃

4   מה־לעשׂות עוד ˢ   ולא עשׂיתי־בו
קויתי ל ᶻ ענבים   ויעשׂ באשׁים׃

III   5   אודיעה־נא אתכם   את־אשׁר־אני עשׂה ᵏ
הסר משׂכתו   והיה לבער ˡ׃

6   ואשׁיתהו בתה   ולא יעדר ᵐ
ו﬩העבים אצוה   מהמטיר עליו ⁿ׃

IV   7   כי־כרם יהוה ᵒ   בית ישׂראל
ואישׁ יהודה   נטע שׁעשׁועיו

ויקו למשׁפט   והנה משׂפח
ויחז לצדקה   והנה צעקה׃

(a) 1 דודי   (b) היה   (c) 2 בתוכו

(d) 2 ויקו (לעשׂות) ענבים   ויעשׂ באשׁים

(e) 3 ועתה   (f) 4 לכרמי   (g) מדוע   (h) לכרמי   (k) לכרמי
5 ועתה (i) עשׂות (j) עשׂות

(l) פרץ גדרו   והיה למרמס׃

(m) 6 לא יזמר   (n) ועלה שׁמיר ושׁית   (o) על   (p) מטר   (q) צבאות

Critical Notes on the Text.

(1) 𝔐 נָא (cf. Gesen.²⁷, § 105, b, n. 3) in אָשִׁירָה־נָּא is enclitic; the preceding אָשִׁירָה should be accented on the ultima, not on the penult; so, too, הֶצֶב־בּוֹ (v. 2), עֲשִׂיתִי־בוֹ (v. 4), אוֹדִיעָה־נָּא (v. 5).

𝔐 לִידִידִי does not mean *to my friend* (AV, *to* my well beloved; RV, *for* my well beloved) or *in honorem Dei quem maxime diligo cantabo* (Grotius). Nor can the prefixed לְ be taken as the לְ *auctoris* (cf. Bachmann's explanation cited below), although in v. 3 the friend to whom the vineyard belongs is introduced as the speaker. The preposition לְ means here *of* (so RVᴹ), that is, *concerning*, as in Ps. 3, 3: רַבִּים אֹמְרִים לְנַפְשִׁי *Many there are who say of me* and in Gen. 20, 13: אִמְרִי־לִי אָחִי הוּא *Say of me, He is my brother*. This לְ is not a popular shortening of אֶל, as Duhm supposes; in his commentary on Ps. 3, 3 Duhm says, לְנַפְשִׁי is a poetic equivalent of עַל־נַפְשִׁי. Nor can we read, with Bachmann,* אֶל־יְדִידִי (*haplography*). Cf. Gesen.²⁷, § 119, u.

𝔐 דּוֹדִי may be a misplaced variant to לִידִידִי in the first hemistich. 𝕾 has ܚܒܝܒܝ for both יְדִידִי and דּוֹדִי. 𝔐 דּוֹדִי is certainly not an abbreviation for דּוֹדִים (Lowth, Cheyne, Budde,† Marti, as an alternative); this parable is no love-ditty (contrast Crit. Notes on Isaiah, SBOT, p. 117, l. 37, and Ginsburg's *Introduction*, pp. 793. 820). Cersoy points, שִׁירַת דּוֹדִי *my love-song*, and Marti is inclined to adopt this emendation as the simplest solution of the difficulty. Bachmann proposes to read שִׁירַת־דָּוִד = שִׁירָה לְדָוִד. According to Winckler, AoF (= *Altorientalische Forschungen*), 1, 341 (1896), the opening lines of the poem should be taken to mean: I will sing to my god a song of my god, concerning his vineyard. My god had a vineyard, &c. He believes that דִּיד or דּוֹד means δαίμων (Dido = ἡ δαίμων) and is inclined to substitute לְדוֹדִי or לְדִידִי for 𝔐 לִידִידִי in the first and third hemistichs of the opening couplet.

After the insertion of דּוֹדִי between שִׁירַת־כַּרְמוֹ it was necessary to prefix לְ to כַּרְמוֹ (𝔊ᵛ τῷ ἀμπελῶνί μου = לְכַרְמִי is influenced by glosses ζ and κ).

Omit 𝔐 הָיָה after כֶּרֶם; the vineyard still belongs to the friend; he tells the men of Judah in v. 5 what he purposes to do with it. The addition of הָיָה was probably suggested by כֶּרֶם הָיָה לְנָבוֹת in 1 K 21, 1; cf. my notes on Cant. 8, 11 (*The Book of Canticles*, p. 60 = Hebraica, 19, 6).

There is hardly any paronomasia between כֶּרֶם and קֶרֶן as Duhm supposes; ק and כ are entirely different consonants. Nor is this case recorded in Dr. Casanowicz's dissertation on Paronomasia in the OT (Boston, 1894). There is just as much assonance between

כרם and שׁמן, *viz.* only one consonant and the vowels are identical.

Bachmann's emendation בקרב גן־שׁמן and Cheyne's בקרב בן שׁמן are not good. Nor need we read, with Kennedy, שׁמשׁ instead of 𝕸 שׁמן; see, however, my remarks on בעל־המון, or rather בעל־חמון, in Cant. 8,11 (*The Book of Canticles*, p. 33, n. 3). In his *Critica Biblica* (London, 1903), p. 10, Cheyne proposes to read בקרב בני ישׁמעאל. The reference, Cheyne adds, is not to the Cimmerians but to the North Arabians. I prefer the received text. 𝕾 ܚܡܪܐ ܘܒ; *cf.* 𝕲 ἐν κέρατι, ἐν τόπῳ πίονι. 𝕸 בן־שׁמן is more poetic than the adjective שׁמן, but it is not chosen on account of the meter; בקרן שׁמן would have suited the meter just as well. Contrast my note on Cant. 1,6 in *The Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902), p. 31, n. 13 = HEBRAICA, **18**, 221.

(2) For 𝕸 שׂרק *cf.* Jer. **2**,21; Gen. **49**,11 and Abulwalîd's explanation quoted in Gesenius' *Jesaia*, part 1 (Leipzig, 1821), p. 231 (repeated in his *Thesaurus*): هو اجود الكرم ويقال له السريق ويكون بالشام. 𝕲ᵀ (i. e., *Fragmenta rescripta Tischendorfiana Isaiae prophetae*) has ἄμπελον σωρηκ, 𝔍 *electam*, 𝕾 ܡܚܕܐ *vines*. A good German equivalent would be *rother Gutedel*.

Winckler, AoF **1**, 350, proposes to read בת instead of מגדל; but *cf.* Mark **12**,1.

𝕸 בתוכו is a superfluous scribal expansion.

The third משׁל of v. 3, 𝕸 ריקו ל(עשׂות)ענבים   ויעשׂ באשׁים, is a scribal expansion derived from the second משׁל of v. 4. Both there and in the present gloss 𝕸 עשׂות represents a subsequent addition; *cf.* ריקו למשׁפט (v. 7ᵉ) and **59**,9.11. 𝔍 inserts *ut faceret* not only in vv. 2. 4 but also in v. 7: *et expectavi ut faceret judicium.* The expression ריקו לעשׂות ענבים, without an indication of the different subject of עשׂות, is illogical; 𝕸 ריקו לעשׂות ענבים is generally supposed to mean, *He* (my friend) *expected that it* (the vineyard) *would bear grapes* (𝕾 ܣܟܝܬ ,ܢܥܒܕ); but this would require at least the insertion of לו, ריקו לו לעשׂות ענבים.

For ריעשׂ באשׁים see my remarks in HEBRAICA, **19**, 138, n. 20.

For באשׁים (𝔍 *labruscae*, French *lambrusque*) *cf.* Gesenius' *Jesaia*, part 1, p. 233; part 2, p. 364, and ZDPV 1888, p. 160 (cited by Marti).

(3) 𝕸 ויתה at the beginning of stanzas II and III (vv. 3. 5) is due to scribal expansion.

𝕾 transposes 𝕸 יושׁב ירושׁלם and אישׁ יהודה; *cf.* my remarks on the Syriac version of Ps. 1 in HEBRAICA, **19**, 137, n. 16 and below, n. 5 of the Explanatory Notes on p. 201.

(4) 𝔐 לְכַרְמִי is a superfluous addition both here and at the end of the first מָשָׁל of stanza III (v. 5).

𝔐 מַדּוּעַ is a scribal expansion. Logically it does not belong to the first hemistich, but to the second: Why, when I had a right to expect good grapes, did it bear worthless, small, sour berries? so correctly ARV and Hendewerk (see above, p. 194, n. *), p. 133; contrast Ernst Meier (see above p. 194, n. ‖), p. 49.

For the insertion of עֲשׂוֹת in 𝔐 לַעֲשׂוֹת עֲנָבִים instead of לַעֲנָבִים see the note on gloss δ (v. 2).

(5) Omit 𝔐 וְעַתָּה, as at the beginning of v. 3.

The rhythm of the second hemistich would perhaps be improved by transposing 𝔐 אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה; in this case we should have to read: אֲנִי, אֶת־אֲשֶׁר עֹשֶׂה־אֲנִי, being enclitic; cf. the notes on v. 1.

For 𝔐 מְשׂוּכָתוֹ read מְשׂוּכָתוֹ. 𝔖 has ܣܝܓܗ for 𝔐 just as in v. 2 for 𝔐 מִגְדָּל.

𝔐 פָּרֹץ גְּדֵרוֹ וְהָיָה לְמִרְמָס is a gloss (or variant) to the preceding מָשָׁל; it may have been suggested by Hos. 2,8. Cf. my notes on Cant. 3, 8. 10; 4, 14 (see my *Book of Canticles*, p. 23, n. 14; p. 49, n. 49), also my note on Ps. 45,16 in Hebraica, 19, 136.

(6) For 𝔐 בָּתָה point בָּתָה, from בתת, Arab. بتّ to cut (قطع), vii to be cut off, decided, ended (انقطع); Assyr. buttutu 'to end' (Delitzsch, HW 192b). Arab. قطع means also to exterminate, to annihilate; cf. Heb. נכרת and הכרית, especially Gen. 41,36: תִּכָּרֵת הָאָרֶץ בָּרָעָב. Bachmann proposes to read, following 𝔊 καὶ ἀνήσω τὸν ἀμπελῶνά μου, בדד (cf. 27,10).

𝔐 וְלֹא יֵעָדֵר; is a scribal expansion of the following 𝔐 לֹא יִזָּמֵר; so, too, 𝔐 וְעָלָה שָׁמִיר וָשָׁיִת; cf. 7,23; 9,17; 10,17; 27,4. With the exception of 9,17 all those passages are post-Isaianic.

Bachmann proposes to read וְעָלוּ instead of 𝔐 וְעָלָה, following 𝔊ᵀ καὶ ἀναβήσονται (var. ἀναβήσεται), 𝔍 et ascendent vepres et spinae, 𝔖 ܘܢܣܩܘܢ; cf. Assyr. elû 'to grow up' (Delitzsch, HW 61a, 4). Bachmann thinks that שָׁמִיר וָשַׁיִת does not stand in the accusative (Ges.²⁷, § 117, z) but is the subject of עָלָה. The clause וְעָלָה שָׁמִיר וָשַׁיִת should therefore be translated, not: It shall shoot up in thorns and briars (so Cheyne in SBOT), but: There shall come up briars and thorns (so ARV). I believe, with Bachmann, that שָׁמִיר וָשַׁיִת is nominative, not accusative; but if the verbal predicate precedes the subject, the plural is not necessary; cf. Ges.²⁷, § 145, o. In Prov. 24,31 the meter requires not only the omission of the superfluous third hemistich כֶּסֶף פָּנֶיהָ חֳרָלִים (see SBOT *ad loc.*) but also the excision of כֻּלּוֹ, so that עָלָה קִמְּשֹׂנִים may be explained in the same way as עָלָה שָׁמִיר וָשַׁיִת, i. e. עָלָה may be verbal predicate to קִמְּשֹׂנִים. Prov. 24,30–34 must be read as follows:

30 עַל־שֹׂדֵה אִישׁ־עָצֵל עָבַרְתִּי   וְעַל־כֶּרֶם אָדָם הֲסַר־לֵב :
31 וְהִנֵּה עָלָה⁶ קִמְּשֹׂנִים⁸   וְגָדֵר אֲבָנָיו נֶהֱרָסָה :
32 וָאֶחֱזֶה⁷ אָשִׁית לִבִּי   רָאִיתִי לָקַחְתִּי מוּסָר :
33 מְעַט־שֵׁנוֹת מְעַט תְּנוּמוֹת   מְעַט־חִבֻּק יָדַיִם לִשְׁכָּב :
34 וּבָא כִמְהַלֵּךְ רִישֶׁךָ   וּמַחְסֹרְךָ כְּאִישׁ מָגֵן :

(α) 30 כֻּלּוֹ   (β) 31 כָּסוּ פָנָיו חֲרֻלִּים   (γ) 32 אָנֹכִי

Also in Is. 34,13 we had better read:

וְעָלְ"ה בְּ'אַרְמְנֹתֶיהָ סִירִים   קִמּוֹשׂ וָחוֹחַ בְּמִבְצָרֶיהָ

𝕸 וְעָלְתָה is due to וְהָיְתָה at the beginning of the following line.
In Is. 32,13 תַּעֲלֶה is Hif'il (=תַּצְמִיחַ); *cf.* my remarks in my
paper on The Beginning of the Judaic Account of Creation in the
Journal of the American Oriental Society, **17**, 158 (1896).
Omission of 𝕸 עַל improves the rhythm.

𝕸 מְטַר at the end of this verse is a superfluous scribal expansion.
(7) Syntactically כֶּרֶם יְהֹוָה is predicate, and בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל subject.
𝕸 צְבָאוֹת is scribal expansion. It is canceled also by Sievers.
𝕸 מִשְׂפָּח seems to be a corruption of מְשַׂחֵת=מִשְׂחָט (in Is.
52,14 it is better to read מָשְׁחַת instead of 𝕸 מִשְׁחַת); *cf.* Heb.
הִשְׁחִית (דרכו); Eth. ስሕተ : sĕḥta, *to err, to sin;* ስሕተት :
sĕḥtat, *error, sin;* ሰሐጠ : saḥáṭa, *to hurt, to injure;* Syr.
ܚܒܠܐ *corruption, destruction;* Arab. سحت suḫt, *corrupt prac-*
tice, undue profit, unlawful gain (اكتسب السحت). The ט
instead of ת is due to the influence of the preceding ח, just as
ס is not unfrequently changed into צ under the influence of an
adjacent ח; *cf.* فَسَح = פֶּסַח = Assyr. puššuxu, *to appease,* see
note 60 of my paper on Babylonian elements in the Levitic Ritual
(*Journal of Biblical Literature*, **19**, 73) and KAT³ 610, n.3. In the
same way we might combine Heb. צָמָה *to sprout* with Assyr.
šamâxu (Delitzsch, HW 669b). In Ges.-Buhl¹³, on the other hand,
Assyr. šamâxu is combined with Heb. שׂוּמָה *to rejoice* and Arab.

شمخ; *to be high* (علا وطال) or *to be proud* (بأنف);
cf. Lat. *lucus laetissimus umbrae,* &c., and l. 8 of the fifth tablet
of the Babylonian Nimrod* Epic (p. 24 of my edition): ṭâbu
çillašu ‖ malî rîšâti; *cf.* Delitzsch, HW 607b and Jensen's
inaccurate translation in Schrader's KB 6, 161 (*ihr guter Schatten*

---

* *Cf.* my remarks in the Critical Notes on Proverbs (SBOT), p. 33, l. 17. It might be well
to state in this connection that I never believed that Nimrod was identical with the Kassite
ruler Nazimaraddaš (see Cheyne-Black's *Encyclopædia Biblica,* 3418); I only suggested,
nineteen years ago, that the name Nimrod might be a contraction of Nazimaraddaš;
see my paper in the *Andover Review,* July, 1884, p. 94; *cf.* KAT³ 581.

ist voll 'Jauchzens;' this would be çillašu ṭâbu rīšâti malī; ṭâbu is, of course, predicate to çillašu); *cf.* my remarks on Jensen's translations in my paper on The Beginning of the Babylonian Nimrod Epic in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. **22**, p. 9; see also vol. **16**, p. cx, and Critical Notes on Proverbs (SBOT), p. 60, 1. 39.

We might also read מִשְׂחָד *bribery*, but מַשָׂחֵט is preferable; in the first place the paronomasia between מִשְׁפָּט and מַשָׂחֵט is more striking, and then the corruption of מַשָׂחֵט to מִשְׂפָּח is more easily explained: the last two consonants of מַשָׂחֵט were transposed, and ט was miswritten פ. Siegfried-Stade, *s. v.* מִשְׂפָּח, suppose that this word was coined by the prophet for the sake of the paronomasia with מִשְׁפָּט. Even if 𝕸 מִשְׂפָּח were correct, it could not mean *bloodshed*, although Arab. سقا means *shedding blood, tyrant* (سفح = اراف). For שׁפֵּת we should expect شفح. Brown-Driver-Briggs, p. 705ᵇ, thinks that the ט in מִשְׂפָּח was substituted for ס. Ges.-Buhl¹³ compares مشقّح mušaffah, *thwarted, unsuccessful; cf.* Assyr. sapâxu, *to annihilate, break up, destroy* (Delitzsch, HW 507ᵇ). In note 80 of his dissertation on Paronomasia in the OT (1894) Dr. Casanowicz suggested that מִשְׂפָּח might be a transposition of מַשְׂחֵק = Assyr. saxâpu, *to overthrow;* but we expect a word for *injustice, corruption* (𝕲 ἀνομία, 𝕴 *iniquitas*). Cheyne's מִזְרָח is impossible.

Before 𝕸 לִצְדָקָה in the last line of the poem the rhythm requires the insertion of a verb, either וִיקַו, as in the preceding line, or וּיֹּחֶל, or וִיחַד, although this form does not occur in the OT.

It is not impossible that the original text read וְהִנֵּה לְמַשָׂחֵט and וְהִנֵּה לִצְעָקָה in the second hemistichs of the last two lines; *cf.* Hagg. 1,9: פָּנֹה אֶל־הַרְבֵּה וְהִנֵּה לִמְעָט; see note 3 of my lecture on the Book of Ecclesiastes in *Oriental Studies* (Boston, 1894), p. 264; *cf.* Ges.²⁷, § 143, e; § 114, i, note 1; Wright-de Goeje³, **2**, 79.

This Isaianic poem may be translated as follows:

PARABLE OF THE VINEYARD.

I   1   I will síng of my fríend, now,   a sóng of ᵃ his víneyard:¹
     My fríend has ᵝ a víneyard   on a spúr that is fértile.²

     2   He hóed it and cléared it,³   and plánted choice vínes⁴ (there);
     He búilt (there) ᵞ a tówer⁵   and héwed out⁶ a wine-vat.ᵟ

(a) 1 my dear one of   (β) had   (γ) 2 in the midst of it
(δ) 2 he lóoked for *it to bear* (choice) clústers,—it bóre sour bérries!

II   3 ₑYe mén of Jerusalem,   fréemen of Júdah!
      Be judges of my case[7]   and thát of my víneyard!

   4 Could áught have been dóne ζ   that Í did not dó there?
     η I lóoked for θ (choice) clusters,—   it bóre sour bérries![8]

III   5 ₑI will gíve you to knów   what I púrpose to dó: κ
      Awáy with its hédges!   that cáttle may brówse there; λ

   6 A wáste be it hénceforth,[9]   μ no spáde ever délve it! ν
     ξ The clóuds will I súmmon   to raín on it néver. ο

IV   7 It is the vineyard of J'HVH,[10] π   the nátion of Ísrael,
      The fréemen of Júdah,   His chérished plantátion.

    He lóoked for corréctness,[11]   but ló! corrúptness![12]
    He hóped for cándor,[13]   but ló! there is clámor![14]

(ε) 3 and now   (ζ) 4 with my vineyard   (η) why   (θ) it to bear   (ι) 5 and now   (κ) with my
(λ)   break dówn[15] its wáll   that dówn it be trámpled!   [vineyard
(μ) 6 it shall not be pruned and   (ν) there shall shoot up thorns and briars
(ξ)   on   (ο) rain   (π) 7 Sabaoth

EXPLANATORY NOTES.

(1) This is the first line of the song. Duhm, Cheyne, Marti, following Ewald, *Propheten*[2], 1, 306, consider the second line to be the beginning of the poem; they think that the first line is a special introduction, but this view is erroneous.

(2) Lit., on a horn, the son of fatness, *i. e.*, the terraced slope of a mountain exposed to the sun, with rich fertile soil; *cf.* the Swiss *Matterhorn, Schreckhorn, Faulhorn*, &c., Lat. *cornu montis*, Greek κέρας τοῦ ὄρους. AVᴹ, the horn of the son of oil; but RVᴹ, a horn, the son of oil. Cf. *apertos Bacchus amat colles* (Virgil, *Georg.* 2, 113) quoted by Delitzsch and Orelli.

(3) Of stones, AV: gathered out the stones thereof; *solum elapidavit*, Pliny 17, 30.

(4) See above, p. 197 (2).

(5) *Cf.* Mark 12,1; Matt. 21,33: A certain man planted a vineyard, and set a hedge about it, and digged a place for the wine-vat, and built a tower. This is based on the Septuagintal rendering of our passage, 𝔊ⱽ καὶ φραγμὸν περιέθηκα καὶ ἐχαράκωσα, 𝕵 *et sepivit eam, et lapides elegit ex illa*, 𝕾, transposing the two terms, ܡܚܣܐ ܡܪܙܘܬ̈ܐ ܘ̇ *he tilled it and made a fence around it*. AV translates therefore, *he fenced it*, or (in the margin) *he made a wall about it* instead of *he hoed it*. RV, *he made a trench about it* or (in the margin) *he digged it*. In the neighborhood of Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Hebron, &c., there are in almost all the vineyards small round tower-like houses of stone, in which

implements are stored and the keepers housed. The owners live in them during the vintage. *Cf.* Dillmann-Kittel[6] (1898) *ad loc.*

(6) Wine-presses and vats, excavated in the solid rock, are common throughout Palestine; see the cut in the translation of Judges, in the *Polychrome Bible*, p. 68.

(7) Supply, *says my friend.* *Cf.* 2 S 12,5; Matt. 21,40.

(8) There is nothing humorous in the second line of v. 4, as Duhm supposes. The prophet's friend (*i. e.* JHVH) says, I confidently expected good grapes, but my vineyard bore nothing but worthless, small, sour berries. I had a right to expect good grapes after all the trouble I had taken.

(9) *Cf.* Is. 7,23–25.

(10) Isaiah does not say, My friend is JHVH, and his vineyard is Israel; he simply states, It is the vineyard of JHVH, *i. e.*, the Israelitish nation.

(11) Correctness of life and conduct, rectitude, justice.

(12) Corruptness, especially of the judges and other persons in power.

(13) Candor = fairness, impartiality, honesty, righteousness.

(14) Loud complaint of injustice and urgent demand for justice; *cf.* Exod. 22,22; Gen. 4,10. Dr. Horace Howard Furness, to whom I am indebted for some valuable suggestions, proposes to render the last couplet:

> He looked for reason,—   but behold! treason;
> For men loving duty,—   but lo! those loving booty!

This last line might be used for the translation of the last but one line of the Hebrew text. The last line of the poem might be rendered:

> He looked for right,—   but behold riot!

(so Dr. Marcus Jastrow). We might also use *justice* and *injustice, honesty* and *dishonesty;* but *correctness* and *corruptness, candor* and *clamor* seem to me preferable.

(15) The Hebrew text uses the infinitive: (I purpose) to break down; so, too, in the preceding double-hemistich, Away with its hedges = (I purpose) to do away with its hedge.